

Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma
University of Oklahoma

Ukrainian Literature: The Last Twenty-Five Years

Author(s): George Luckyj

Source: *Books Abroad*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Spring, 1956), pp. 133-140

Published by: [Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40095373>

Accessed: 22/06/2014 06:29

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma and University of Oklahoma are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Books Abroad*.

<http://www.jstor.org>



GEORGE LUCKYJ
(see page 133)



MILO DOR
(see page 141)

BOOKS ABROAD

Ukrainian Literature

The Last Twenty-five Years

By GEORGE LUCKYJ

TWENTY-FIVE years ago Ukrainian literature* was in full bloom. In the Soviet Ukraine the poems of Tychyna, Rytsky, Bazhan, Sosyura, Zerov, Pluzhnyk, the novels of Yanovsky, Pidmohylny, Antonenko-Davydovych, the short stories of Kosynka, Khvylovy, Slisarenko, Senchenko, Panch, Lyubchenko, Vyshnya, and the plays of Mykola Kulish were definite signs of achievement. All these writers reached artistic maturity under the Soviet regime, yet most of them, regardless of whether they belonged to the so-called proletarian or non-proletarian literary organizations, wrote in the Western European literary tradition. In their works modern Ukrainian literature came of age. In the early 1920's it appeared likely that the process of "Europeanization," begun in Ukrainian literature long before the Revolution of 1917, was successfully nearing completion. This meant that Ukrainian writers no longer felt compelled to emphasize the national and folk aspects of their art in order to emancipate themselves from the Russian political and cultural domination which had stifled literary life in the Ukraine for two centuries prior to 1917. They could now transcend the limits of "ethnographic" literature more easily than their predecessors in the nineteenth century who had attempted to imitate Western European masters while remaining Ukrain-

ian patriots. In one sense, therefore, the Revolution of 1917 put an end to nationalism in Ukrainian literature, since it liberated it from the constant preoccupation with the problems of national freedom, revolution, and self-fulfillment. Conditions created by the Revolution of 1917 were such that Ukrainian writers could become primarily interested in man, not only in Ukrainian man. Not that man exists in literature as a nationless abstraction. After all, the goal of the moderns, and the successful achievement of some nineteenth century Ukrainian writers, was to show Ukrainian man in relation to life, not merely in his reaction to Ukrainian or Russian life, though sometimes the more limited treatment may reach universality through the magic mirror of art.

The early work of the poet of the Ukrainian revolution, Pavlo Tychyna ("The Clarinets of the Sun," 1918; "Plough," 1920; "The Wind from the Ukraine," 1924), provides the best example of complete "Europeanization" and emancipation of modern Ukrainian literature. This Ukrainian Symbolist, writing about the revolution in the Ukraine as an event of universal, almost cosmic significance, succeeded in creating images of unequalled rhythmical beauty through the blending of folksong and poetry. Tychyna's early poems stand in sharp contrast to his later Stalinist panegyrics; they belong, together with the contemporary works by the poets Rytsky and Zerov, to the modern Western patrimony.

* This article is part of our survey of the world's various national literatures during the past quarter century.
—The Editors.

Had the Communist regime in the Ukraine succeeded in solving the national problem in that republic, it is very likely that Ukrainian literature would have followed an independent course, oriented towards Western Europe, though without attempting to emulate it. However, the national problem, which provided the focus of attention for pre-Revolutionary Ukrainian literature, remained unsolved; moreover, it became more acute than ever before. In the ensuing discussion of nationalism in Ukrainian literature it must be always borne in mind that, essentially, the "national problem" within the Soviet Union is but one aspect of the more fundamental issue of individual freedom.

The large measure of political and cultural independence granted to the Ukraine in 1919 by the Communists was a temporary concession dictated by necessity and expediency rather than by reasons of principle. Lenin's policy of granting the Ukrainians the right to self-government was qualified by a very important condition which in reality negated that right: that the Ukraine should stay in closest union with Russia. Ukrainian culture and literature were encouraged purely as a means of strengthening socialist and communist ideology among the masses. The Soviet rulers were disappointed in their hope that the Ukrainians would embrace this ideology, presented to them in their national form, for the official policy actually tended to intensify Ukrainian resistance to Russian influence. As soon as the Bolsheviks realized that Ukrainian literature was bent on following an independent path they applied firm controls, while branding it as "nationalist." After 1925, the problem of "nationalism" in Soviet Ukrainian literature became, therefore, a burning issue, leading finally to the complete subjection of this literature to the Communist Party.

However, the charges of "nationalism" were only partly true. In the mid-Twenties, when they were first levelled, nationalism in Ukrainian literature was fairly mild;

it increased in the years immediately following, partly as a result of the vigorous self-defense put up by the Ukrainian writers against attacks from Moscow. In 1925, apart from the Symbolists, Futurists, Neoclassicists, and the fellow-traveler group *Lanka*, none of which was in the least nationalist, there were two other literary groups—*Pluh*, an organization of peasant writers, and VAPLITE, an organization of proletarian writers. Only the latter group, which exhibited the most communist spirit of all the literary groups, could be classified as nationalist, although national-communist would be a more appropriate term. Taking advantage of the liberal attitude to literature, expressed by the Party in the 1925 resolution on literature, these Ukrainian literary groups were, each in their own way, preoccupied with aesthetic rather than political problems.

VAPLITE, descended ideologically from the Ukrainian Communist Party "Borotba," was led by the fiery and gifted writer Khvylovy, who openly expressed what many Ukrainian Communists felt at that time. Impatient with Moscow's reserved attitude towards the unfettered development of Ukrainian culture, he claimed the right of the Ukrainian Communists to govern their own affairs and called on his countrymen to turn away from Moscow and to behave like an independent nation which, nominally, they were. Although he drew upon himself and the VAPLITE the ire of the Kremlin and was subjected to severe castigation by Stalin (1926), he continued to organize an effective resistance to Party control of the literature and culture of the Ukraine.

One of Khvylovy's major successes was the initiation of the so-called "Literary Discussion" (1925–28) in which hundreds of writers participated in the press and in literary meetings at which questions of literary theory and ideology were very thoroughly discussed. This last free debate to take place in Soviet Ukrainian literature produced results which the Party found im-

possible to accept. These may be summed up in three most important conclusions: (1) Ukrainian literature should follow Western rather than Russian models (Khvylovy); (2) it should occupy itself with the study of the sources of Western civilization and literature (Zerov); (3) it should not aim at satisfying the masses at the expense of quality, but should attempt to reach the highest artistic standards.

The Party's reaction to this was to dissolve VAPLITE and to issue (in 1927) a resolution on literature in which other literary groups (the Neoclassicists) also came under fire as bourgeois nationalists. The resolution stated that the development of national literatures within the U.S.S.R. must proceed not by contrasting them with each other but by brotherly cooperation between them. The new policy, guided from 1930 onwards by Stalin and dictated by the demands of the Five-Year Plan, attempted to create a literature "socialist in content and national in form." The idea itself might have had some merit, but the methods used to put it into practice made the phrase meaningless. In the Ukraine the period of the first Five-Year Plan (1928–1932) was marked by the most violent purges of cultural and literary organizations. Constant charges of nationalist deviation tended to polarize literary life to such an extent that writers were regarded as either trusted Party supporters or "enemies of the people." During this bitter struggle between the regime, bent on achieving conformity and obedience at any price, and the Ukrainian poets, novelists, and playwrights, special mention must be made of the determined resistance by the latter to the dictates of the Party.

Khvylovy who, after the dissolution of VAPLITE, made several public recantations, continued to lead this opposition. He refused to be classed as a deviationist and, constantly regrouping his forces, started new literary ventures without surrendering his basic premises and his fondest hope that Ukrainian Communist writ-

ers would be given a measure of autonomy. During 1929–30 he helped to publish the magazine "Literary Fair" which, in Aesopian language, contained some of the most caustic satire on the Soviet regime ever written in the U.S.S.R. After the suppression of this periodical Khvylovy organized a new literary group, *Polifront*, and when this was dissolved, he and many of his numerous followers joined the Party-sponsored All-Ukrainian Union of Proletarian Writers. In 1932, following a new Party resolution on literature, all literary organizations in the U.S.S.R. were dissolved in order to clear the way for the Pan-Soviet Writers' Union. Khvylovy and his associates prepared themselves for a final stand. In the next few years (1932–35) the purge of Ukrainian writers claimed over one hundred victims. Among them were Khvylovy (who shot himself in 1933), Kulish, Pidmohylny, Pluzhnyk, Slisarenko, Zerov, Antonenko-Davydovych, Dosvitny, Epik, Dray-Khmara, Fylypovych, Semenko, Shkurupiy, Yohansen, and Gzhytsky, all writers of the first rank.

The purge also had another purpose. Those who were not destroyed were, from then on, subjected to the Party controls. Among them were Tychyna, Rylsky, Bazhan, Smolych, Yanovsky, Sosyura, and others. The leading personalities in the Ukrainian branch of the Writers' Union, who were the instruments of the Party in the purges, Kulyk, Mykytenko, Kovalenko, Koryak, and Kyrylenko, were themselves removed to oblivion, in accordance with Stalin's policy of "purging the purgers." Most of these writers who had accepted Party controls in the early Thirties have continued to create in conformity with these controls up to the present day. Although the standard of this conformity varied, the insistence upon it remained the same.

It is against this background of literary politics that we must approach Soviet Ukrainian literature. Is it possible to assess

its artistic value both before and after the purges? The losses which it suffered during the early Thirties cannot be measured only in terms of human suffering, though they indeed were enormous. They comprised a whole range of belles-lettres, poetry, and drama, now banned from all libraries and bookstores in the U.S.S.R.

It is, perhaps, little wonder that poetry figured most prominently in the literary renaissance of the 1920's in the Soviet Ukraine. Not only was it the least expensive literary product in the days of paper shortage; it was also most suited to become the true mirror of the Revolution and the touchstone of the post-Revolutionary developments. The poets were the first to feel and to express the exhilaration of the Revolutionary war, which lasted in the Ukraine until 1920. They were also the first to notice the exhaustion of the revolutionary impetus, and the setting in of a philistine, conservative reaction after the establishment of the Soviet Union in 1923. Some of them, especially the Futurists, rejoiced for a time in the destruction of the old order and themselves attempted to destroy the accepted literary conventions. Following the example of the Russian Futurist poet, Mayakovsky, some Ukrainian Futurists (Semenko) turned Communist, but, as Trotsky pointed out, the Communist Futurists were more Bohemian than revolutionary. On the whole, the Ukrainian Futurists took little part in Communist agitation. They continued to be literary and ideological anarchists, only more disillusioned and cynical than before; some of them joined other literary groups, until, having outlived their usefulness to the Party, one by one they disappeared from the literary scene.

The Symbolists, who were scarcely even a group, disintegrated soon after the Revolution. In the poems of Tychyna, Ukrainian Symbolism reached its zenith. Other, less outstanding representatives were Dmytro Zahul, Yakiv Savchenko, Mykola Tereshchenko, and Oleksa Slisarenko. The

latter, who also wrote some good short stories, went over to the Futurists and later to VAPLITE.

The greatest contribution to Ukrainian poetry in the first decade after the Revolution was made by the Neoclassicists (Mak-sym Rylsky, Mykola Zerov, Mykhaylo Dray-Khmara, Pavlo Fylypovych, and Oswald Burghardt, writing under the *nom de plume* Yuri Klen). The greatest of them all was Rylsky, an unsurpassed master of the subjective lyric, and a brilliant translator. In his aesthetic credo, Rylsky wrote that "lyric poetry is to me the recreation of the past in the present. I cannot write anything else." This assertion proved false, and Rylsky was compelled by the circumstances of Soviet dictatorship to take an interest in socialist construction and to follow "social command."

A poet of lesser talent but of greater personal integrity than Rylsky was the chief theorist of the Neoclassicists, Mykola Zerov. Also a distinguished literary critic and professor of literature, Zerov began his poetic career with the publication of translations of Roman classical poets. Some of his own poems, in particular his sonnets, are the most classically perfect ever written in Ukrainian. Zerov's aesthetic and literary beliefs are contained in his essays "To the Sources" (1926). Apart from Zerov, who wrote in the tradition of the Greek and Roman classical poets and the French Parnassians, the Neoclassicists were the last disciples of Romanticism and Symbolism.

Several poets of the Twenties who were not associated with any definite school or organization or who changed their loyalties so often as not to strike any firm root also deserve to be mentioned. Among them were Yevhen Pluzhnyk, member of the *Lanka*; Todos Osmachka, a peasant poet of great talent; Mykola Bazhan, who today enjoys the honor of being a "court poet"; and Oleksa Vlyzko, executed in 1934.

The so-called "proletarian" writers were in a group by themselves. They formed several organizations (*Hart*, VAPLITE,

VUSPP, *Politfront*, *Molodnyak*) and had the clearly political and ideological aim of promoting the growth of "proletarian consciousness," and of serving the Party and the state, although the interpretation of this service differed a great deal. It would be a mistake to think that all the proletarian writers were Party propagandists. In the Twenties there were among them several outstanding poets, novelists, and playwrights. They were often aptly described as Revolutionary Romantics.

The poems of Vasyl Chumak, Vasyl Ellan-Blakytny, Volodymyr Sosyura, the short stories of Mykola Khvylovy, Yuri Yanovsky, Oles Dosvitny, and the plays of Mykola Kulish were the best products of this school. All of them were concerned in their works with the Ukrainian revolution which seemed to them to hold out the hope of national and universal progress, and which, as Khvylovy wrote in one of his poems, "was to turn the steppes of Zaliznyak and Honta into a new America." The intense disillusion which set in as this hope was extinguished pervades all their later works.

Artistically, the highest achievement in proletarian poetry was that of Sosyura, while Khvylovy's short stories and Kulish's plays were the finest in their respective fields. The latter showed promise of becoming a great playwright. Giving his own interpretation to the Communist slogan "re-education of contemporary mentality," Kulish declared himself in favor of a drama "which disturbs and awakens" the spectator and "outlines sometimes very sharply certain problems, perhaps not always to his taste." Kulish had an able associate in the producer and director of the *Berezil* Theater, Les Kurbas, himself a firm adherent of the drama which "would aim at a revolution, a kind of overthrow, a progression in advance of the spectator." Several of Kulish's plays, although topical ("The People's Malakhiy," 1927; *Myna Mazaylo*, 1928; *Sonata Pathétique*, 1930; *Małlena Grasa*, 1933) are masterpieces of modern

Ukrainian drama. The *Sonata Pathétique*, depicting the struggle between the Reds, the Whites, and the Ukrainian nationalists during the Revolution, was performed with great success by Tairov in the Kamerny Theater in Moscow (1932) and at the Dramatic Theater in Leningrad. In spite of this, after running for three months, the play was severely criticized in *Pravda* as nationalist and was subsequently withdrawn. Two years later, its author was arrested and deported.

The Soviet Ukrainian novel showed little achievement. Among the non-proletarian novelists Valerian Pidmohlyny in the novel "The City" (1928) gave a powerful portrayal of the contrast between the village and the city under the new regime, while Yuri Yanovsky's "Four Sabres" (1929) is Revolutionary Romanticism at its best. Among the proletarian writers, Khvylovy ("The Woodsnipes," 1927), Dosvitny ("The Americans," 1925), Volodymyr Gzhytsky ("The Black Lake," 1929), and Hryhory Epik ("The First Spring") tried their hand at writing a novel, without much success. Two factors were responsible for their failure: They were all in quest of a new form for the novel and, unlike the Russian Sholokhov, rejected nineteenth century models; secondly, the authors mentioned were silenced before they had time to develop their craft. A valuable contribution to the field of the novel was also made by Yuri Smolych who at one time showed signs of becoming a writer of good adventure stories. Andriy Holovko ("Mother," 1931), and Petro Panch ("The Blue Echelons," 1927) were also Ukrainian novelists of some note. A most original short story writer, executed in 1934, was Hryhory Kosynka, the author of "In the Wheat-fields" (1926).

After the establishment of the Soviet Writers' Union in 1934 the only school left open to Soviet writers was that of Party-sponsored "socialist realism." Having passed through the ordeal of the purges,

the Ukrainian writers closed their depleted ranks and accepted the new literary dogma. This did not necessarily mean that they had completely abandoned their previous aesthetic and philosophic quests. Now, however, they could no longer express their opposition to the new dogma nor could they ignore some aspects of it. If they did, they were called to order and had duly to admit their "errors." It may be that some writers, especially those brought up in the Communist spirit, did not feel the imposition of controls to be a restriction on their creative powers. Yet, with very few exceptions, Ukrainian literature of the late Thirties hardly matched the achievement of the Twenties.

According to a Soviet textbook,

The basic principle of socialist realism is the creation of a positive type of a man of action. This principle may be expressed in different genres, subjects, and themes, but, above all, both subjects and themes should be contemporary. In the Ukraine this task is chiefly performed by the poets in lyric and epic works. The creation of the positive contemporary pictures leads the poets to the monumental biographical genre which began to flourish in Soviet conditions. Thus numerous works were written about Lenin, Stalin, and their companions, Kirov, Dzerzhinski, Gorky . . . (S. Maslov, Ye. Kyrylyuk, *Narys istoriyi ukrayins'koyi literatury*, Kiev, 1945, p. 258).

Many works in the 1934-41 period belonged to this "monumental biographical" hagiography. Tychyna, Rylsky, Bazhan, Sosyura, Senchenko, as well as the younger writers Malyshko, Pervomaysky, Usenko, Holovanivsky sang paeans to Stalin. The only new and original talent was that of the playwright Oleksander Korniychuk ("The Death of the Squadron," 1933; *Platon Krechet*, 1934; *Bohdan Khmelnytsky*, 1938; *Front*, 1942, English translation, 1943). Provocative was Kocherha's play *Masters of Time*, translated into English in 1937. Several novelists refashioned their works to suit the demands of Socialist Realism (Holovko's "Mother," "Weeds"; Panch's "The Siege of the Night"). Some continued to write epics of the civil war (Yanovsky's

"The Horsemen," 1935), while others glorified socialist construction (Mykytenko's "Morning"). On the whole, the period of the late Thirties marks a sharp decline in artistic achievement.

During the Second World War Ukrainian writers were allowed and even encouraged to extol Ukrainian patriotism as a means of rallying the people in the struggle against the Germans. Although such expressions of national sentiment inevitably had to be tempered by an acknowledgment of the "friendship of the Soviet peoples" (Rylsky's "To the Ukraine," Tychyna's "The Burial of a Friend," Malyshko's "My Ukraine," Bazhan's "The Oath"), the appeal to Ukrainian patriotism was overwhelming. The fact that in urging the Ukrainians to resist the invaders the Kremlin appealed to their national and not to their socialist or Communist feelings is of the greatest significance.

The consequences of this brief national revival (1941-45) and of the temporary relaxation of controls were alarming to the Party. In 1946 it condemned the very same literature which it had encouraged a few years earlier. Rylsky, Korniychuk, Yanovsky ("The Living Water"), and finally Sosyura ("Love the Ukraine") had to admit, under very strong pressure, that they had seriously deviated in the direction of Ukrainian nationalism. The campaign against Ukrainian nationalism in literature, coupled with the most violent denunciation of the West (Malyshko's "Beyond the Blue Ocean," 1950) and the propagation of Soviet messianism (Honchar's "The Standard Bearers," 1948), continued until Stalin's death. It is too early to say whether the recent signs of a literary tremor in the Soviet Ukraine are anything more than a temporary overhaul of the old line.

In 1939, and again in 1944, Western Ukraine came into the orbit of the U.S.S.R. The literature of this part of the Ukraine which, from 1919 to 1939 was incorporated in Poland, followed a different course from

that of the Soviet Ukraine. To be sure, the close literary relations between them, firmly established before the Revolution, continued after 1919. Almost every literary event in the east re-echoed in some manner in the west (especially in the group around the journal "New Paths"), while developments in western Ukrainian literature influenced both the Soviet Ukrainian writers and Communist literary strategists. Free from political and ideological guidance, western Ukrainian literature exhibited a variety of tendencies and schools. On the other hand, Polish chauvinist and reactionary policy in matters of Ukrainian culture often forced writers to seek refuge in nationalism.

The remnants of the modernist movement, centered before the First World War in and around the "Young Muse," nurtured by Western European tradition, survived in western Ukraine little longer than in the east. Some of its representatives (Bohdan Lepky) took to writing historical fiction, while others (the Symbolist group *Mytusa*) failed to produce outstanding works. An older writer of unquestioned greatness, even by European standards, who stood aloof from literary groups, was the short story writer Vasyl Stefanyk. His miniature psychological studies of peasant life ("The Earth," 1926), together with his earlier works, are among the finest achievements of Ukrainian literature.

A forum for extreme nationalist literary tendencies was provided by the magazine *Visnyk*. One of its contributors, the *émigré* poet Yevhen Malanyuk, today remains one of the finest craftsmen in the Ukrainian language, a poet whose verse offers a definite interpretation of Ukrainian history. Different, but equally talented, was the work of the lyric poet Bohdan Antych, who died in 1937 at the age of twenty-eight ("Salutation to Life," 1931; "The Three Rings," 1934; "The Green Bible," 1938). Three other Galician poets (Bohdan Kravtsiv, Syvatoslav Hordynsky, and Yuri Ko-

sach) deserve a brief mention. The latter also excels as a writer of novels and short stories.

The most prominent western Ukrainian novelist was Ulas Samchuk (*Volhynia*, a trilogy, 1932-37; "The Mountains Speak," 1934; *Maria*, 1934; *Ost*, 1948). The trilogy, dealing with peasant life in Volhynia, is by now a classic. Iryna Vilde, Natalena Koroleva, and Halyna Zhurba were leading women novelists.

Between the two World Wars two centers of Ukrainian life in Europe, outside the Ukraine, made important contributions to literature. One of them was in Prague, consisting, among others, of the poets Yuri Darahan, Yuri Klen, Oleksa Stefanovych, Oksana Lyaturynska, Oleh Olzhych, Leonid Mosendz, Olena Teliha, and the dramatist Mykola Chyrsky. The other center was in Warsaw where the poets Natalia Livytska-Kholodna, Yaroslav Dryhynych, and the novelist Yuri Lyra were to be found. Only a few of these treated non-Ukrainian themes successfully while much of their work was vitiated by overindulgence in nostalgia for the lost homeland.

As a result of the last war many Ukrainian writers, from both east and west, found themselves in Western Europe, and several today are in the United States and Canada. From the Soviet Ukraine, among others, came Arkady Lyubchenko (died in 1945, author of a moving wartime journal), Ivan Bahryany ("Tiger Catchers," 1946; "The Orchard of Gethsemane," 1950), Dokiya Humenna ("Children of the Chumak Road, 1948), Viktor Domontovych ("Doctor Serafikus," 1947), Todos Osmachka ("The Poet, 1947), and Vasyl Barka ("The White World," 1947). Leading western Ukrainian writers now living in America are Kosach, Samchuk, and Hordynsky. Of recent works, those most worthy of special attention are the novels "Plan for the Court" (1951) by Osmachka, and "Paradise" (1953) by Barka.

In summing up the Ukrainian literary achievement of the last quarter of a century certain tentative conclusions may be drawn, although the future alone can reveal its importance in the history of literature. The promise of an original and well-developed literature in the Soviet Ukraine remained unfulfilled on account of the Communist Party controls. However, in spite, and perhaps because of them, Ukrainian literature exhibited a great variety of talent, richness of ideas and forms, and was characterized by an unceasing search for new modes of expression. Conditions under which this lit-

erature developed have failed to create a climate in which writers could function as individuals and unfold great art. The renascent nation, divided between several political regimes bent on denying to it freedom of cultural development, has produced in literature a true mirror of its aspirations. These bear testimony to the native genius of the Ukrainians, their love of liberty, and their desire to participate in the creative quest together with other nations of the West.

University of Toronto



According to the *Information Bulletin of the Library of Congress*, the Rare Books Division of the Library of Congress has received a copy of the first edition of the first Italian translation of the *Verdadera relación de la conquista del Perú*, a narrative of the overthrow of the Inca empire which was written in Peru in March 1533 by an eyewitness, Francisco de Xeres, secretary to Francisco Pizarro. The translation was made by Domingo de Gaztelu, Ambassador of the Emperor Charles V at the Court of Venice, and bears the title *Libro Primo de la Conquista del Peru & Provincia del Cuzco de le Indie Occidentali*. Published in Venice in March 1125, it contains all of Xeres's text, with the exception of the last sentence and 21 stanzas of verse.

In cooperation with the late writer's family, the S. Fischer Verlag (Frankfurt a.M., Zeil 65-69) is preparing an inclusive edition of Thomas Mann's letters. The publisher asks all who received or presently own letters by the departed to make available the originals for a short while or to submit photostats (expenses incurred for these will be reimbursed). Letters addressed to Thomas Mann as well as biographically interesting material will also be of great importance for the editing of the Thomas Mann letters.

Albert Bonniers Förlag of Sweden, one of the five largest publishing enterprises in the world, has sold 210,000 copies of the Swedish edition of *Cell 2455* by Caryl Chessman, 437,000 copies of the first two volumes of Wilhelm Moberg's immigrant trilogy, 40,000 copies of the Swedish edition of *Northwest Passage* by Kenneth Roberts. These are only a few examples of the popularity of foreign works. Other titles on their fall list are Norman Mailer's *The Naked and the Dead*, with 52,000 copies, and *Greta Garbo* by John Bainbridge, with 85,000 copies. These figures are all the more impressive when we consider that the United States has 26 times the population of Sweden.

The new bimonthly cultural review, *Mito*, directed by Jorge Gaitán Durán and published in Brazil, is sponsored by Vicente Aleixandre, Luis Cardoza y Aragón, Carlos Drummond de Andrade, León de Greiff, Octavio Paz, and Alfonso Reyes. Its aims: "presentar textos en donde el lenguaje haya sido llevado a su máxima densidad o a su máxima tensión, más exactamente, en donde aparezca o una problemática estética o una problemática humana." Its policy is to set aside all dogmatism, all sectarianism, all prejudice.